



Mainstreaming life cycle thinking through a consistent approach to footprints

Ridoutt, Brad; Pfister, Stephan ; Manzardo, Alessandro; Bare, Jane; Boulay, A.; Cherubini, F.; Fantke, Peter; Frischknecht, Rolf; Hauschild, Michael Zwicky; Henderson, Andrew

Total number of authors:
21

Published in:
Abstract book - EcoBalannce 2016

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Ridoutt, B., Pfister, S., Manzardo, A., Bare, J., Boulay, A., Cherubini, F., Fantke, P., Frischknecht, R., Hauschild, M. Z., Henderson, A., Jolliet, O., Levasseur, A., Margni, M., McKone, T., Michelsen, O., Mila i Canals, L., Page, G., Pant, R., Raugei, M., ... Verones, F. (2016). Mainstreaming life cycle thinking through a consistent approach to footprints. In *Abstract book - EcoBalannce 2016*

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Mainstreaming life cycle thinking through a consistent approach to footprints

Ridoutt, B., Pfister, S., Manzardo, A., Bare, J., Boulay, A., Cherubini, F., Fantke, P., Frischknecht, R., Hauschild, M., Henderson, A., Jolliet, O., Levasseur, A., Margni, M., McKone, T., Michelsen, O., Milà i Canals, L., Page, G., Pant, R., Raugei, M., Sala, S., Verones, F.

Over recent years, footprints have emerged as an important means of reporting environmental performance. Some individual footprints have become quite sophisticated in their calculation procedures. However, as an overall class of environmental metrics they have been poorly defined, having a variety of conceptual foundations and an unclear relationship to LCA. The variety and sometimes contradictory approaches to quantification have also led to confusing and contradictory messages in the marketplace which have undermined their acceptance by industry and governments.

In response, a task force operating under the auspices of the UNEP/SETAC Life Cycle Initiative project on environmental Life Cycle Impact Assessment has been working to develop generic guidance for developers of footprint metrics. The initial work involved forming a consensual position on the difference between footprints and existing LCA impact category indicators. In short, footprints are deemed to have a primary orientation toward society and nontechnical stakeholders and report only on selected topics of concern. On the other hand, LCA impact category indicators have a primary orientation toward technical stakeholders and report in relation to a larger framework designed for comprehensive evaluation of environmental performance and trade-offs.

The task force has also developed a universal footprint definition. In parallel to *Area of Protection*, we introduce *Area of Concern*. In the same way that LCA uses impact category indicators to assess impacts that follow a common cause-effect pathway toward Areas of Protection, footprint metrics address Areas of Concern. The critical difference is that Areas of Concern are defined by the interests of stakeholders in society rather than the LCA community. In addition, Areas of Concern are stand-alone and not part of a framework intended for comprehensive environmental performance assessment. Accordingly, footprints are universally defined as *metrics used to report life cycle assessment results addressing an Area of Concern*.